DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 302 314 JC 890 041

TITLE JTCC's Holding Power: A Study of Student Retention. Fall 1987 to Winter & Spring 1988.
INSTITUTION John Tyler Community Coll., Chester, VA. Office of Institutional Research.
PUB DATE Jan 89
NOTE 44p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Community Colleges; *Dropout Characteristics; Dropout Rate; Dropout Research; Enrollment Influences; Followup Studies; Full Time Students; Grade Point Average; Part Time Students; Questionnaires; *Student Attrition; Student Educational Objectives; Two Year Colleges; Two Year College Students; *Withdrawal (Education)

ABSTRACT

In 1988, a study was conducted at John Tyler Community College (JTCC) to investigate patterns in student retention during the 1987-88 academic year. A survey was mailed to 124 full-time and 237 part-time students who enrolled in the fall quarter but did not return for the winter or spring quarters. Study findings, based on a 50% response rate, included the following: (1) 52.5% of the 4,855 students who attended JTCC in fall 1987 did not attend the subsequent winter or spring quarters; (2) 95% of the non-returning students were attending part time; (3) the highest attrition rates were found among students who were attending JTCC to upgrade or develop their skills; (4) 84% of the non-returning students had earned 15 or fewer credits; (5) the top three reasons for full-time respondents not returning to JTCC were "lack of time due to job requirements," "lack of time due to family responsibilities," and "financial problems"; (6) the top three reasons for part-time students not returning were "lack of time due to job requirements," "completed courses I desired to take," and "lack of time due to family responsibilities"; (7) at the time of the survey, a majority of both the full- and part-time respondents were employed full time and were not attending school; and (8) a majority of the full- and part-time respondents felt that JTCC was very or somewhat helpful in assisting them to achieve their goals, and stated that they planned to return to JTCC in the future. The survey instrument is included. (AAC)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED302314

# JTCC'S HOLDING POWER:

## A Study of Student Retention

## at John Tyler Community College

Fall 1987
to
Winter and Spring 1988

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

C.S. Hollins

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Conducted by
The Office of Institutional Research
January 1989

JC 890 041

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE OF CONTENTS


| | Page |
|---|---|
| List of Tables | v |
| Executive Summary | 1 |
| Introduction | 4 |
| Methodology | 6 |
| Background Information on Survey Respondents | 14 |
| Responses to the Survey Instrument | 18 |
| Findings | 25 |
| Recommendations | 27 |
| References | 28 |
| Appendix | 29 |

- Student Comments
- Instrument

LIST OF TABLES


| Table | | Page |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | Background Information on All Non-Returning Students . . . | 9 |
| 2 | Non-Returning Students by Division, Curriculum and Unclassified Status . . . . . | 12 |
| 3 | Characteristics of Full- and Part-Time Non-Returning Respondents . . . . . | 14 |
| 4 | Non-Returning Respondents by Division, Curriculum and Unclassified Status . . . . . | 17 |
| 5 | Non-Returning Respondents by Reasons for Choosing JTCC . . . . . | 18 |
| 6 | Non-Returning Respondents by Goal or Objective for Enrolling . . . . . | 18 |
| 7 | Non-Returning Respondents by Extent to Which Courses Assisted Students in Achieving Goal . . . . . | 19 |
| 8 | Non-Returning Respondents' Reasons for Not Returning . . . | 20 |
| 9 | Non-Returning Respondents by Current Employment/ Educational Status . . . . . | 21 |
| 10 | Non-Returning Respondents by Work Status . . . . . | 22 |
| 11 | Non-Returning Respondents by Educational Status . . . . . | 22 |
| 12 | Non-Returning Respondents by Promotion . . . . . | 23 |
| 13 | Non-Returning Respondents by Plans to Return . . . . . | 23 |

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Office of Institutional Research conducts an annual survey of students who leave the College after attending one or more sessions. The current study presents information on students who attended the Fall 1987 quarter and did not return for the subsequent Winter and Spring 1988 quarters. The purpose of the study is to (1) generate a profile on students who failed to return, (2) determine the students' goals/objectives for enrolling and whether the College had assisted them in achieving those goals/objectives, (3) identify reasons why they did not return, (4) ascertain their current activities (i.e., working, attending school, or both), (5) find out if they intend to return to JTCC in the future, and (6) provide possible insight on retention strategies and recommendations for future research.

Two computer printouts identifying students that fit the IN-OUT-OUT model (students who attended the Fall 1987 quarter and did not return for the subsequent Winter and Spring 1988 quarters) were provided by the Computer Center. After adjusting for graduation candidates, ELI students with overlapping quarter courses, FCI inmates, and students who returned for the Spring session, the total number of non-returnees was 2,548. With an adjusted Fall enrollment figure of 4,855, the attrition rate was 52.5 percent.

Due to the continuing concern over the decrease of full-time students, all non-returning full-time students were surveyed. A 10 percent sample was utilized for part-time non-returnees. A total of 361 non-returnees was surveyed. The overall response rate was 50 percent (53.2 percent for part-timers and 43.5 percent for full-timers). It should be noted that because the full-time non-returnees were

oversampled, analyses of the survey respondents are reported by the respondents' full- or part-time status.

The following is a summary of the principal findings of the study:

1. Over half (52.5 percent) of the 4,855 students that attended the Fall 1987 quarter did not attend the subsequent Winter or Spring 1988 quarters. The sex and race of non-returnees was proportional to that of the Fall 1987 population.

2. The proportion of part-time students who did not return to the College was greater than the proportion of part-timers who were enrolled Fall 1987 (85 percent of the student body consisted of part-timers whereas 95 percent of the non-returnees were part-timers).

3. Students outside of JTCC's service area tended to stop attending at a slightly higher rate than those residing within the Service Area.

4. The proportion of unclassified students in the sample was greater than the proportion that comprised the Fall 1987 student body (64 percent of the adjusted Fall 1987 population were unclassified, whereas 83 percent of the non-returnees were unclassified). The largest attrition rates were observed for students who were "upgrading skills" (81 percent) and "developing skills" (63 percent).

5. A large majority of non-returnees had earned 15 or fewer credits (84 percent). Almost half (49 percent) had a grade point average between 3.01 and 4.00. And not surprisingly, a majority left the College in "good standing."

6. For both full- and part-time respondents, the two most frequently chosen reasons for attending the College were (1) close to home and (2) the courses/programs offered.

7. The full- and part-time respondents differed in their ranking of goals/objectives for enrolling at the College. The two most frequently chosen goals for full-time respondents were (1) to receive a degree/certificate, and (2) to take job-related courses. In contrast, part-time respondents indicated (1) to take job-related courses, and (2) to satisfy a personal interest.

8. A large majority of both full- and part-time respondents stated that JTCC was very helpful or somewhat helpful in assisting them to achieve their goal.

9. The top three reasons for full-time respondents not returning to JTCC were (1) lack of time due to job requirements, (2) lack of time due to family responsibilities, and (3) financial problems.

10. The top three reasons for part-time respondents not returning to JTCC were (1) lack of time due to job requirements, (2) completed courses they desired to take, and (3) lack of time due to family responsibilities.

11. At the time of the survey, a majority of both full- and part-time respondents were employed full-time and not in school. Those respondents who were in school said they were enrolled primarily as part-time students.

12. For both full- and part-time respondents, a majority stated that they planned to return to the College in the future.

## INTRODUCTION

> Only when institutions understand the reasons for nonpersistence will they be able to assert some control over their enrollments (Ferguson, et al., 1986:8).

Interest in student retention and attrition in higher education has grown in recent years. This interest has been attributed to administrators in higher education experiencing a "dual dilemma"--coping with a decline in traditional age students and a restricted flow of resources (Smith, 1986:11; Ferguson, et al., 1986). The result has been to focus on ways to retain more currently enrolled students by investigating why some students do not return. Not surprisingly, researchers probing the dynamics of student attrition have pointed out that it makes little sense for institutions of higher education to beat the bushes for new students if they cannot adequately serve those who are currently enrolled. As frequently remarked, it costs more to recruit a new student than to keep a current one (Rosenberg & Czepiel, 1983).

It has been documented that the attendance pattern of two-year institutions is unique. "Two-year college attendance is now being viewed as objective completion rather than degree completion" (Willett, 1983). This suggests that dichotomizing students as either persisters or nonpersisters oversimplifies the population of non-returning students. Not being sensitive to the various groups of nonpersisters could result in overestimating the retention problem at an institution. It could also prohibit the identification of subgroups that could benefit from particular forms of assistance. Therefore, by accurately identifying nonpersisters, administrators and counselors can learn the

extent and dynamics of their retention problem and gain insight into the potential solutions.

The following report attempts to generate a profile of students who failed to re-enroll, provide information on why they left, determine whether they plan to return, and recommend ways in which the College might better serve future students. This report covers (1) an overview of the methodology, (2) general background information on all non-returning students, (3) general background information on the respondents, (4) the students' responses to a ten-item survey instrument, and (5) a summary of the major findings and recommendations.

## METHODOLOGY

In order to identify students who enrolled in the Fall 1987 quarter but did not return for the Winter and Spring 1988 quarters, the Office of Institutional Research requested two printouts from the JTCC Computer Center. The first printout (Fall to Winter) listed all students enrolled in the Fall 1987 quarter who did not return for the Winter 1988 quarter. The second printout listed all students enrolled in the Fall 1987 quarter who did not return for the Spring 1988 quarter.

A total of 2,889 students were listed as non-returning between the Fall 1987 and Winter 1988 quarters. This initial figure suggests an attrition rate of 56 percent. However, it was recognized that certain groups of students should be eliminated from this listing. Eliminated were 54 graduation candidates, 85 students in Extended Learning Institute courses that extended beyond the Fall quarter and who were not graduation candidates, and 21 students who were inmates at the Federal Correctional Institution (FCI). Finally, the Fall to Winter and Fall to Spring printouts were compared to exclude students who had re-enrolled for the Spring 1988 quarter. An additional 181 students were subsequently eliminated. The adjusted total of non-returning students for the In-Out-Out enrollment pattern (Fall to Winter and Spring) was 2,548 for an overall attrition rate of 52.5 percent.

### Sample Design

Due to the continuing concern over the decrease of full-time students, the decision was made to contact all full-timers enrolled in the Fall quarter who did not return for the Winter and Spring quarters (N=124). Of the 2,424 part-time non-returning students, a 10 percent

sampling scheme was initiated. Specifically, every tenth part-timer was selected from an alphabetical listing. This resulted in a sample size of 237 part-timers. (There were five students identified as non-returnees at the time of the sampling procedure that were later identified as graduate candidates (2) or FCI inmates (3). These students were eliminated from the sample.)

Survey Instrument

A brief survey instrument consisting of 10 items was administered to the sample (See Appendix). Excluded from this instrument were demographic data items provided on the printouts (name, sex, race, curriculum, phone number, jurisdiction, attendance status, cumulative hours, cumulative grade point average, and academic standing).

Survey Administration

Two methods were used to administer the survey instrument. In early July the instrument was mailed to each student in the sample. This yielded a response rate of 9.7 percent (10.5 percent for part-timers and 8.1 percent for full-timers). In August, follow-up phone calls were made to students who did not respond to the initial mailing. Calls were made during the day and early evening hours. Students were called at least twice, once during the day and once at night. A third attempt was made if a date and time were suggested by the respondent. The follow-up calls yielded an additional response rate of 40.2 percent (43.6 percent for part-timers and 35.5 percent for full-timers). As reflected below, the overall response rate for the sample was 50 percent (53.2 percent for part-timers and 43.5 percent for

full-timers). It should be noted that a second mailing was conducted for six students that did not have a phone number listed. No additional instruments were returned. Of the 181 non-respondents, 28.2 percent had moved or new phone numbers could not be provided, 18.2 percent had disconnected telephones, and 6.6 percent simply refused to be interviewed.

RESPONSE RATE BY SURVEY METHOD

| | Total Sample | Mail Responses | | Telephone Responses | | Total Response Rate | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | No. | Percent | No. | Percent | No. | Percent |
| Full-time | 124 | 10 | 8.1% | 44 | 35.5% | 54 | 43.5% |
| Part-time | 237 | 25 | 10.5% | 101 | 42.6% | 126 | 53.2% |
| Total | 361 | 35 | 9.7% | 145 | 40.2% | 180 | 49.9% |

## Statistical Analysis

The data were keyed and analyzed using Lotus 1-2-3 and SPSS/PC+. Since it was decided to include all full-time non-returning students in the sampling scheme, the full- and part-time respondents were analyzed separately. This was done to offset the overrepresentation of full-time students in the sample. Statistical analyses were limited to frequencies and cross tabulations due to small expected cell frequencies.

TABLE 1

BACKGROUND INFORMATION ON
ALL NON-RETURNING STUDENTS
(Fall 1987 to Winter and Spring 1988)

| | N | PCT |
|---|---|---|
| TOTAL | 2,548 | 100 |
| SEX | | |
| Male | 1,164 | 46 |
| Female | 1,384 | 54 |
| RACE | | |
| White | 1,853 | 73 |
| Black | 507 | 20 |
| Other | 188 | 7 |
| ATTENDANCE STATUS | | |
| Full-time | 124 | 5 |
| Part-time | 2,424 | 95 |
| CUMULATIVE HOURS | | |
| 0 - 15 | 2,149 | 84 |
| 16 - 35 | 201 | 8 |
| 36 - 50 | 50 | 2 |
| 51 - 75 | 56 | 2 |
| 76 - 100 | 44 | 2 |
| Over 100 | 48 | 2 |
| CUMULATIVE GRADE POINT AVERAGE* | | |
| 0.00 - 1.00 | 457 | 18 |
| 1.01 - 2.00 | 286 | 11 |
| 2.01 - 3.00 | 546 | 21 |
| 3.01 - 4.00 | 1,259 | 49 |
| ACADEMIC STATUS | | |
| Good Standing | 1,746 | 69 |
| Academic Warning | 271 | 11 |
| Academic Probation | 46 | 2 |
| Academic Suspension | 12 | ** |
| Academic Dismissal | 5 | ** |
| Reinstated | 0 | - |
| Dean's List | 19 | 1 |
| Honor's List | 35 | 1 |
| No Standing Code | 414 | 16 |
| JURISDICTION | | |
| Amelia | 15 | 1 |
| Charles City | 4 | ** |
| Chesterfield | 911 | 36 |
| Dinwiddie | 78 | 3 |
| Prince George | 150 | 6 |
| Surry | 13 | 1 |
| Sussex | 27 | 1 |
| Colonial Heights | 189 | 7 |
| Hopewell | 179 | 7 |
| Petersburg | 214 | 8 |
| Richmond | 234 | 9 |
| Total In Service Area | 2,014 | 79 |
| Total Out of Service Area | 534 | 21 |
| PROGRAM | | |
| College Transfer | 87 | 3 |
| Occupational/Technical | 290 | 11 |
| Certificate | 66 | 3 |
| Unclassified | 2,105 | 83 |

* Rounding error
** Less than 1 percent

Table 1 shows that:

- Of the 2,548 non-returning students, 46 percent were males and 54 percent were females. These proportions are close to those for the Fall 1987 student body (43 and 57 percent, respectively).

- Seventy-three percent of the non-returning students were white, 20 percent were black, and 7 percent were categorized as other. Again, these proportions are almost identical to the Fall 1987 population (74, 20, and 6 percent, respectively).

- The overwhelming majority of non-returning students were classified as part-time students (95 percent). Unlike the sex and race breakdowns, attendance status does not coincide with the overall Fall 1987 proportions (85 percent were part-time and 15 percent full-time).

- A substantial majority (84 percent) of the non-returning students earned 15 or fewer credit hours. Eight percent earned 16 to 35 credit hours, and the remaining groups (36 - 50 credits, 51 - 75 credits, 76 - 100 credits, and over 100 credits) each earned 2 percent of the total credit hours.

- Almost half (49 percent) of all non-returning students had a grade point average (GPA) within the range of 3.01 to 4.00. Another 21 percent had a GPA within the 2.01 to 3.00 range.

Eleven percent had GPA's within the 1.01 to 2.00 range and 18 percent had GPA's of 1.00 or less.

- Consistent with GPA's, 69 percent of the non-returning students were classified as in "good standing" (an additional 2 percent were on the Dean's List or Honor's List). Only 2 percent of the non-returning students were on academic probation and 11 percent were on academic warning. Note that 16 percent of the non-returning students did not have a status code.

- The number of non-returning students who reside in the cities and counties that comprise the College's Service Area was relatively proportionate to those in the student body. However, students who live outside of the College's Service Area tended to stop attending at a slightly higher rate than those who resided within the Service Area.

- A large majority of the non-returning students were unclassified (83 percent). This proportion was significantly greater than their proportion in the Fall 1987 student body (63.1 percent). Interestingly, two out of three unclassified students did not return to JTCC in the Winter and Spring Quarters 1988.

TABLE 2
NON-RETURNING STUDENTS
BY DIVISION, CURRICULUM AND
UNCLASSIFIED STATUS

| DIVISION | ENROLLED FALL 1987* | NON-RETURN WINTER & SPRING 1988* | ATTRI-TION RATE |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Business Division** | | | |
| Business Administration | 180 | 43 | 24% |
| Accounting | 85 | 24 | 28% |
| Beverage Marketing | 9 | 3 | 33% |
| Data Processing | 175 | 53 | 30% |
| Management | 205 | 58 | 28% |
| Secretarial Science | 58 | 21 | 36% |
| Police Science | 70 | 20 | 29% |
| Clerical Studies | 13 | 6 | 46% |
| Educational Secretary | 6 | 0 | 0% |
| Subtotal | 801 (16%) | 228 (9%) | 28% |
| **Communications & Social Sciences Division** | | | |
| Education | 43 | 8 | 19% |
| General Studies | 86 | 20 | 23% |
| Liberal Arts | 33 | 7 | 21% |
| Human Services | 84 | 16 | 19% |
| Child Care | 36 | 8 | 22% |
| Teacher Aide | 3 | 0 | 0% |
| Subtotal | 285 (6%) | 59 (2%) | 21% |
| **Engineering Technologies Division** | | | |
| Architecture | 41 | 8 | 20% |
| Automotive Tech | 28 | 4 | 14% |
| Electronics Tech | 106 | 19 | 18% |
| General Engineering | 52 | 15 | 29% |
| Instrumentation | 35 | 12 | 34% |
| Auto Diagnosis | 5 | 3 | 60% |
| Building Construction | 4 | 0 | 0% |
| Machine Shop | 7 | 2 | 29% |
| Welding | 14 | 5 | 36% |
| Subtotal | 292 (6%) | 68 (3%) | 23% |
| **Math, Natural Sciences, & Allied Health** | | | |
| Science | 24 | 9 | 38% |
| Funeral Services | 36 | 3 | 8% |
| Nursing | 213 | 34 | 16% |
| Subtotal | 273 (6%) | 46 (2%) | 17% |
| **Career Studies (3 Divisions)** | | | |
| Subtotal | 100 (2%) | 42 (2%) | 42% |
| **Unclassified Status** | | | |
| Audit | 4 | 1 | 25% |
| Career Exploration | 127 | 74 | 58% |
| Developing Skills | 139 | 88 | 63% |
| High School Students | 119 | 38 | 32% |
| Pending Curriculum | 492 | 250 | 51% |
| Personal Satisfaction | 383 | 224 | 58% |
| Restricted Enrollment | 28 | 9 | 32% |
| Transfer/Non-Degree | 90 | 28 | 31% |
| Transient | 11 | 5 | 45% |
| Upgrading Skills | 1,711 | 1,388 | 81% |
| Subtotal | 3,104 (64%) | 2,105 (83%) | 68% |
| GRAND TOTAL | 4,855 (100%) | 2,548 (101%)** | 52% |

( ) - Column Percent of Total Non-Returning Students

* Fall 1987 enrollment and non-returning students do not include graduation applicants, ELI students whose work extended into the next term, and FCI students.

** Rounding error

Table 2 gives the number of students enrolled in the Fall 1987 sessions and those students who did not re-enroll by Division, Curriculum, and Unclassified Status. (Note that the 1987 Fall enrollment totals have been adjusted to exclude applicants for graduation, ELI students whose course extended over two terms, and inmates.) The subsequent attrition rate for each curriculum is also provided. The Divisions of Business, Communications & Social Sciences, Engineering Technologies, and Math, Natural Sciences & Allied Health had attrition rates ranging from 17 to 28 percent. Career Studies students, who enrolled in various areas of study, exhibited an attrition rate of 42 percent. The largest attrition rates were found with students who were unclassified (81 percent in Upgrading Skills and 63 percent in Developing Skills).

BACKGROUND INFORMATION ON
SURVEY RESPONDENTS

TABLE 3
CHARACTERISTICS OF
FULL- AND PART-TIME
NON-RETURNING RESPONDENTS

| | FULL-TIME | PERCENT | PART-TIME | PERCENT |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| TOTAL | 54 | 100.0 | 126 | 100.0 |
| SEX | | | | |
| Male | 24 | 44.4 | 59 | 46.8 |
| Female | 30 | 55.6 | 67 | 53.2 |
| RACE | | | | |
| White | 30 | 55.6 | 109 | 86.5 |
| Black | 24 | 44.4 | 17 | 13.5 |
| CUMULATIVE CREDITS | | | | |
| 15 or fewer | 35 | 64.8 | 106 | 84.1 |
| 16 - 35 | 11 | 20.4 | 12 | 9.6 |
| 36 or more | 8 | 14.8 | 8 | 6.3 |
| GRADE POINT AVERAGE | | | | |
| 0 - 1.00 | 22 | 40.7 | 24 | 19.0 |
| 1.01 - 2.00 | 9 | 16.7 | 12 | 9.6 |
| 2.01 - 3.00 | 8 | 14.8 | 25 | 19.8 |
| 3.01 - 4.00 | 15 | 27.8 | 65 | 51.6 |
| JURISDICTION | | | | |
| Amelia | 2 | 4.0 | 0 | 0 |
| Charles City | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Chesterfield | 19 | 35.0 | 46 | 37.0 |
| Dinwiddie | 1 | 2.0 | 3 | 2.0 |
| Prince George | 4 | 6.0 | 14 | 11.0 |
| Surry | 1 | 2.0 | 2 | 2.0 |
| Sussex | 1 | 2.0 | 0 | 0 |
| Colonial Heights | 2 | 4.0 | 7 | 6.0 |
| Hopewell | 7 | 13.0 | 6 | 5.0 |
| Petersburg | 7 | 13.0 | 7 | 6.0 |
| Richmond | 4 | 6.0 | 18 | 14.0 |
| Total In Service Area | 48 | 89.0 | 103 | 82.0 |
| Total Out of Service Area | 6 | 11.0 | 23 | 18.0 |

Table 3 presents the characteristics of non-returning full- and part-time respondents. The following list summarizes Table 3.

- The proportion of males and females was fairly similar for both full-time and part-time respondents.

- White and nonwhite full-time respondents had fairly similar proportions. In contrast, part-time respondents were primarily white (86.5 percent).

- A majority of full-time respondents had earned 15 or fewer credits (64.8 percent). In fact, 85.2 percent had earned 35 or fewer credits. Similarly, a large majority of part-time respondents had earned 35 or fewer credits (93.7 percent). Most part-time respondents had earned 3 or fewer credits (57.9 percent).

- A large proportion of full-time respondents had GPA's of 1.00 or less (40.7 percent). However, 42.6 percent had GPA's above 2.00 (14.8 percent between 2.01 and 3.00 and 27.8 percent between 3.01 and 4.00). In contrast, over half of the part-time respondents had GPA's above 3.00 and a significantly lower proportion were under 1.00 (51.6 and 19.0 percent, respectively). The difference between full- and part-time respondents is further pronounced by the mean scores (1.844 for full-timers and 2.772 for part-timers).

- The proportion of non-returning respondents within JTCC's Service Area is similar for full- and part-time students (89 and 82 percent

respectively). For both full- and part-time respondents, the jurisdiction with the largest proportion of respondents was Chesterfield County (35 and 37 percent, respectively).

Table 4 presents non-returning full- and part-time respondents by Division, Curriculum, and Unclassified Status. As expected, a majority of the full-time respondents was classified (67 percent). Of the divisions, the Business Division had the largest proportion of full-time respondents (28 percent). In contrast, again as expected, a large majority of part-time respondents was unclassified (86 percent). Note that 65 percent of the unclassified part-time respondents were identified as "upgrading skills." As with the full-timers, the division with the largest proportion of non-returning part-time respondents was the Business Division (10 percent).

TABLE 4
NON-RETURNING RESPONDENTS
BY DIVISION, CURRICULUM AND
UNCLASSIFIED STATUS

| DIVISION | FULL-TIME | PART-TIME |
|---|---|---|
| **Business Division** | | |
| Police Science | 1 | 1 |
| Business Administration | 6 | 2 |
| Accounting | 1 | 2 |
| Data Processing | 2 | 2 |
| Management | 3 | 5 |
| Office Systems Tech | 2 | 0 |
| Subtotal | 15 (28%) | 12 (10%) |
| **Communications & Social Sciences Division** | | |
| General Studies | | 1 |
| Liberal Arts | 2 | |
| Human Services | 3 | |
| Child Care | 1 | |
| Subtotal | 6 (11%) | 1 (**) |
| **Engineering Technologies Division** | | |
| Electronics Tech | | 1 |
| General Engineering | 2 | 3 |
| Instrumentation | 1 | 0 |
| Welding | 1 | 0 |
| Subtotal | 4 (7%) | 4 (3%) |
| **Math, Natural Sciences, & Allied Health** | | |
| Funeral Service | 2 | 0 |
| Nursing | 2 | 0 |
| Subtotal | 4 (7%) | 0 (0) |
| **Career Studies (3 Divisions)** | | |
| Subtotal | 7 (13%) | 1 (**) |
| **Unclassified Status** | | |
| Career Exploration | 1 | 5 |
| Developing SKills | 0 | 4 |
| High School Students | 0 | 1 |
| Pending Curriculum | 6 | 15 |
| Personal Satisfaction | 0 | 12 |
| Restricted Enrollment | 0 | 0 |
| Transfer | 4 | 1 |
| Transient | 0 | 0 |
| Upgrading Skills | 8 | 70 |
| Subtotal | 18 (33%) | 108 (86%) |
| GRAND TOTAL | 54 (99%)* | 126 (99%)* |

( ) - Column Percent of Total Non-Returning Students
* Rounding error
** Less than 1%

## RESPONSES TO THE SURVEY INSTRUMENT

Table 5 presents the primary reasons full- and part-time respondents gave for choosing to attend JTCC. Not surprisingly, the most frequently chosen reason given by full-timers was "close to home" (40.9 percent). The second most frequent reason was the "courses/ programs" offered by the College (28.0 percent). Similarly, the reasons chosen most frequently by part-time respondents were "close to home" (32.3 percent) followed by "courses/programs" (30.4 percent). Note that

TABLE 5
NON-RETURNING RESPONDENTS
BY REASONS FOR CHOOSING JTCC

| STATUS | Close to Home | Inex-pensive | Open Adm | Courses/ Program | Fin. Aid | Job Require | Other Reason | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Full-time | 22.1 | 1.5 | 1 | 15.1 | 1.8 | 5 | 7.3 | 53.8 |
| Row Pct | 40.9 | 2.8 | 1.9 | 28.0 | 3.3 | 9.3 | 13.5 | 99.7* |
| Part-time | 40.8 | 2.3 | 4.0 | 38.3 | 0 | 31.2 | 8.5 | 126.1 |
| Row Pct | 32.3 | 1.8 | 3.1 | 30.4 | 0 | 24.8 | 7.5 | 99.9* |

* Rounding error

almost a quarter of the part-time respondents indicated that their reason for attending JTCC was to meet "job requirements" (24.8 percent). Additional insight was provided by many respondents indicating the courses were contracted through JTCC by their employer (See Appendix).

TABLE 6
NON-RETURNING RESPONDENTS
BY GOAL OR OBJECTIVE FOR ENROLLING

| | FULL-TIME | | PART-TIME | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| GOAL | N | COL PCT | N | COL PCT |
| Job Related Course | 11.0 | 20.4 | 65.5 | 52.0 |
| Degree/Certificate | 30.5 | 56.5 | 15.5 | 12.3 |
| Career Choice | 2.0 | 3.7 | 6.0 | 4.8 |
| Transfer | 6.5 | 12.0 | 3.0 | 2.4 |
| Personal Interest | 1.0 | 1.9 | 30.0 | 23.8 |
| Other | 3.0 | 5.6 | 6.0 | 4.8 |
| Total | 54.0 | 100.1* | 126.0 | 100.1* |

* Rounding error

The full- and part-time respondents' goals or objectives for enrolling at JTCC are presented in Table 6. The majority of full-time respondents stated their primary goal was to receive a "degree/certificate" (56.5 percent). The second most frequent response was to take "job related courses" (20.4 percent). Unlike full-time respondents, the majority of part-time respondents stated that their primary goal was to take "job related courses" (52.0 percent). The second most frequent response by part-time respondents was to satisfy a "personal interest" (23.8 percent). Note that only 12.3 percent of the part-time respondents said their goal was to obtain a "degree or certificate."

TABLE 7
NON-RETURNING RESPONDENTS
BY EXTENT TO WHICH COURSES
ASSISTED STUDENTS IN ACHIEVING GOAL

| STATUS | Very Helpful | Some-what Helpful | Not Very Helpful | Not At All Helpful | No Response | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Full-time | 21 | 27 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 54 |
| Row Pct | (38.9) | (50.0) | (7.4) | (1.9) | (1.9) | (100.1)* |
| Part-time | 58 | 52 | 10 | 5 | 1 | 126 |
| Row Pct | (46.0) | (41.3) | (7.9) | (4.0) | (1.0) | (100.2)* |

* Rounding error

Table 7 presents the students' evaluations of the extent JTCC assisted them in achieving their goal. A large majority of the full-time respondents stated that JTCC was either "very helpful" or "somewhat helpful" (88.9 percent). In particular, 38.9 percent of the full-time respondents stated that JTCC was "very helpful" and 50.0 percent stated JTCC was "somewhat helpful." Similarly, a large majority

of part-time respondents stated that JTCC was either "very helpful" or "somewhat helpful" (87.3 percent). Specifically, 46.0 percent of part-time respondents indicated "very helpful" and 41.3 percent said "somewhat helpful."

TABLE 8
NON-RETURNING RESPONDENTS'
REASONS FOR NOT RETURNING*

| REASON | FULL-TIME | PCT | PART-TIME | PCT |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Completed courses that I desired to take | 5 | 9 | 38 | 30 |
| Lack of time due to job requirements | 26 | 48 | 48 | 38 |
| Lack of time due to family responsibilities | 16 | 30 | 28 | 22 |
| Course(s) that I needed were not available | 2 | 4 | 14 | 11 |
| Financial problems | 12 | 22 | 8 | 6 |
| Transferred to another college | 10 | 19 | 3 | 2 |
| Was failing or not doing as well as wanted | 5 | 9 | 3 | 2 |
| Medical reasons | 3 | 6 | 5 | 4 |
| No longer interested in school | 3 | 6 | 1 | 1 |
| Other | 13 | 24 | 34 | 27 |

*Note: Full-timers (N = 54)
Part-timers (N = 126)

Table 8 highlights the full- and part-time respondents' reasons for not returning after the Fall 1987 quarter. Note that respondents were asked to select all items that were applicable. The top three reasons indicated by full-time respondents were "lack of time due to job

requirements" (48 percent), "lack of time due to family responsibilities" (30 percent), and "financial problems" (22 percent). The top three reasons given by part-time respondents were "lack of time due to job requirements" (38 percent), "completed courses that I desired to take" (30 percent), and "lack of time due to family responsibilities" (22 percent). Not surprisingly, few part-time respondents selected "financial problems" (6 percent).

TABLE 9
NON-RETURNING RESPONDENTS
BY CURRENT EMPLOYMENT/EDUCATIONAL STATUS

| PROGRAM | Working | In School | Working & in School | Not Working or in School | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Full-time | 39 | 1 | 6 | 5 | 51 |
| Row Pct | (76) | (2) | (12) | (10) | (100) |
| Part-time | 101 | 0 | 7 | 9 | 117 |
| Row Pct | (86) | | (6) | (8) | (100) |

Missing: 3 Full-time
9 Part-time

The employment and educational status of full- and part-time respondents is presented in Table 9. The majority of full-time respondents were employed but not in school (76 percent). Another 12 percent were employed and attending school, and 10 percent were neither employed nor in school. As for part-time respondents, an overwhelming majority were employed but not in school (86 percent). An additional 6 percent were employed and attending school, and 8 percent were neither employed nor in school.

TABLE 10
NON-RETURNING RESPONDENTS
BY WORK STATUS
FALL 1987

| WORK STATUS | Full-time | Part-time |
|---|---|---|
| Full-time | 41 | 109 |
| Col Pct | (76) | (87) |
| Part-time | 7 | 6 |
| Col Pct | (13) | (5) |
| Not Employed | 6 | 10 |
| Col Pct | (11) | (8) |
| Total | 54 | 125 |
| Col Pct | (100) | (100) |

Missing: Part-time 1 case

Table 10 presents the work status of full- and part-time respondents. Based upon the reasons given for not re-enrolling at the College, it was not surprising to find that both full- and part-time respondents were primarily employed full-time. In particular, 76 percent of the full-time and 87 percent of the part-time respondents were employed full-time.

TABLE 11
NON-RETURNING RESPONDENTS
BY EDUCATIONAL STATUS
FALL 1987

| FALL 1987 STATUS | CURRENT EDUCATIONAL STATUS Full-time | Part-time |
|---|---|---|
| Full-time | 3 | 3 |
| Col Pct | (43) | (43) |
| Part-time | 4 | 4 |
| Col Pct | (57) | (57) |
| Total | 7 | 7 |
| Col Pct | (100) | (100) |

The educational status of full- and part-time respondents is presented in Table 11. Although the numbers are very small, Table 11 indicates that a slight majority of those in school were attending on a part-time basis (57 percent for both full- and part-timers). This is

not surprising since 86 percent of the full-timers and 100 percent of the part-timers were also employed.

TABLE 12
NON-RETURNING RESPONDENTS
BY PROMOTION

| | Yes | No | Not Applicable | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Full-time | 4 | 45 | 5 | 54 |
| Row Pct | (7) | (83) | (9) | (99)* |
| Part-time | 10 | 107 | 8 | 125 |
| Row Pct | (8) | (86) | (6) | (100) |

* Rounding error
Part-time 1 case missing

Students were asked if they had received a promotion since the completion of courses at JTCC. As shown in Table 12, 7 percent of the full-time respondents and 8 percent of the part-timers had received a promotion. It should be noted that 2 part-time respondents were employed after leaving the College but not at the time of the survey. Although neither was currently employed, 1 respondent had received a promotion.

TABLE 13
NON-RETURNING RESPONDENTS
BY PLANS TO RETURN

| PROGRAM | Yes | No | Missing | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Full-time | 30 | 24 | 0 | 54 |
| Row Pct | (56) | (44) | | (100) |
| Part-time | 85 | 38 | 3 | 126 |
| Row Pct | (67) | (30) | (2) | (99)* |

* Rounding error

Table 13 presents former students' responses when asked if they plan to return to JTCC. A slight majority of the full-time respondents intend to enroll at the College in the future (56 percent). A larger majority of part-time respondents said they plan to re-enroll later (67 percent).

Additional analyses revealed that proportionately more female and nonwhite full-time respondents intend to return to JTCC than their counterparts (63.3 percent for females and 45.8 percent for males; 36.7 percent for whites and 79.2 percent for nonwhites). The responses were more disparate for part-time respondents who plan to return (81.3 percent for females and 55.9 percent for males). However, the gap closed significantly between part-time whites and nonwhites (70.6 percent and 68.9 percent, respectively).

The largest proportion of full-time respondents who did not intend to return to the College said their primary reason for not returning was "lack of time due to job requirements" (37.5 percent). In contrast, a significant proportion of the part-time respondents said they did not plan to return because they "completed the courses desired" (42 percent indicated this was their primary reason and 11 percent said it was their secondary reason).

## FINDINGS

The following is a summary of the principal findings of this study:

1. Over half (52.5 percent) of the 4,855 students that attended the Fall 1987 quarter did not attend the subsequent Winter or Spring 1988 quarters. The sex and race of non-returnees was proportional to that of the Fall 1987 population.

2. The proportion of part-time students who did not return to the College was greater than the proportion of part-timers who were enrolled Fall 1987 (85 percent of the student body consisted of part-timers whereas 95 percent of the non-returnees were part-timers).

3. Students outside of JTCC's Service Area tended to stop attending at a slightly higher rate than those residing within the Service Area.

4. The proportion of unclassified students in the sample was greater than the proportion that comprised the Fall 1987 student body (64 percent of the adjusted Fall 1987 population were unclassified, whereas 83 percent of the non-returnees were unclassified). The largest attrition rates were observed for students who were "upgrading skills" (81 percent) and "developing skills" (63 percent).

5. A large majority of non-returnees had earned 15 or fewer credits (84 percent). Almost half (49 percent) had a grade point average between 3.01 and 4.00. And not surprisingly, a majority left the College in "good standing."

6. For both full- and part-time respondents, the two most frequently chosen reasons for attending the College were (1) close to home and (2) the courses/programs offered.

7. The full- and part-time respondents differed in their ranking of goals/objectives for enrolling at the College. The two most frequently chosen goals for full-time respondents were (1) to receive a degree/certificate and (2) to take job-related courses. In contrast, part-time respondents indicated (1) to take job-related courses and (2) to satisfy a personal interest.

8. A large majority of both full- and part-time respondents stated that JTCC was very helpful or somewhat helpful in assisting them to achieve their goal.

9. The top three reasons for full-time respondents not returning to JTCC were (1) lack of time due to job requirements, (2) lack of time due to family responsibilities, and (3) financial problems.

10. The top three reasons for part-time respondents not returning to JTCC were (1) lack of time due to job requirements, (2) completed

courses they desired to take, and (3) lack of time due to family responsibilities.

11. At the time of the survey, a majority of both full- and part-time respondents were employed full-time and not in school. Those respondents who were in school said they were enrolled primarily as part-time students.

12. For both full- and part-time respondents, a majority stated that they planned to return to the College in the future.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

The following are recommendations based on the findings and student comments:

1. A sample of students should be asked to evaluate class scheduling periodically in an effort to better meet their scheduling needs.

2. The College should better evaluate its marketing efforts with businesses and industries in the area, particularly those listed in the Appendix.

3. Retention strategies should also be evaluated and modified for various subpopulations, or restructured as students' needs change.

In order to accurately study student enrollment patterns, a longitudinal (tracking) study is required. Students should be categorized based on their educational goals and expectations for enrolling. After the relevant groups have been identified, a profile of the subpopulations should be generated. Each subgroup can then be targeted with various intervention techniques to improve their retention rate. Since each group will probably have specific goals and needs, one solution for the overall institution is not likely to result in a successful retention effort. As Ferguson (et al., 1986:5) stated: "Merely recognizing that there are various types of nonpersisters does not help an institution increase its persistence rate. The institution next needs to develop a retention plan for each category, realizing that it <u>is</u> possible to influence a student's retention status."

## REFERENCES


Ferguson, Jeffery M., Ronald E. Wisner, and Richard Discenza. Developing a Framework for Student Retention: A Challenge to Traditional Enrollment Approaches. NASPA Journal, Vol. 24, No. 2, Fall 1986, 2-9.

Willet, Lynn H. "One-Stop or Stop-Out?" A Five-Year Longitudinal Analysis of Community College Attendance. Community/Junior College Quarterly, 7:333-341, 1983.

Smith, Terry B. The Coming Revolution in College Retention Strategies. NASPA Journal, Vol. 24, No. 2, Fall 1986, 10-13.

Rosenberg, L. J. and J. Z. Czepiel. A Marketing Approach for Customer Retention. The Journal of Consumer Marketing, 1, 1983, 45-51.

# APPENDIX

## STUDENT COMMENTS

WHY DID YOU CHOOSE TO ATTEND JTCC? (RESPONDENT CHOSE "OTHER" AND WROTE THE FOLLOWING, OR PROVIDED ADDITIONAL INFORMATION)

- High School Diploma
- Wanted to learn about computer operations
- Mandatory
- Good reputation/school
- Sponsored by employer
- Contracted (17 respondents gave this answer)
- Heard about the course
- Recommended by friends
- Required by Ft. Lee
- Offered through the Children's House
- To obtain a degree
- Good School
- To learn a skill
- To take basics
- Job (welding)
- Only place in state to study Funeral Service
- To improve GPA
- To go to college, know some people at JTCC

WHAT WAS YOUR PRIMARY GOAL/OBJECTIVE FOR ENROLLING AT JTCC? (RESPONDENT CHOSE "OTHER" AND WROTE THE FOLLOWING)

- High School Diploma
- To equip me to take the State License Exam (Real Estate)
- To take a couple computer courses
- Contracted
- Mandatory
- To play tennis
- Needed to get some courses out of the way
- To make more money
- To further education
- To obtain an AA and eventually a BA
- To further education
- To improve GPA

THE FOLLOWING IS A LIST OF REASONS WHICH MAY HAVE PREVENTED YOU FROM ATTENDING COLLEGE AFTER THE FALL QUARTER. PLEASE CIRCLE AS MANY ITEMS AS ARE APPLICABLE AND PROVIDE COMMENTS WHERE APPROPRIATE. (RESPONDENT CHOSE "OTHER" AND WROTE THE FOLLOWING)

- Loss of income from divorce.
- I intend to eventually take more courses.
- Was requested to take a simple Math (5th - 6th grade level) class that had nothing to do with Accounting.
- Fire Science courses were not available.
- No appropriate transportation to attend further.

- Live 150 miles from JTCC.
- Too long a commute.
- Joined military-would pay for schooling.
- Attending VCU.
- Wife pregnant.
- Distance (live in Hampton).
- Have not decided what to do.
- Contracted courses.
- Not interested in a degree. Wanted to try college courses.
- Only course that I wanted to take.
- Already have my BA.
- Already have AA degree.
- Just did not enroll.
- Already have BA degree.
- Not what was expected; time consuming.
- Getting instruction elsewhere; state funds short!
- Moved.
- Does not know what to pursue-going to change/start a new career.
- Graduated from VCU recently.
- Does not need advanced Autocad course yet.
- Already has BA degree.
- Waiting for new equipment; then plans to take course to assist in learning the new equipment.
- Too young to be enrolled full-time (student is 12 years old).
- Does not need more schooling.
- Ordered to take course-has an MAS already.
- Transferred to J. Sargeant Reynolds Community College.
- Already has 3 years of college.
- Change jobs.
- Works night shift.
- Loss of transfer credit for Virginia Tech.
- Took a break.
- COBOL class was very involved. I was spending a lot of time in lab which prevented me from working (part-time).
- Taking courses at VCU.
- Transferred to Southside Virginia Community College. JTCC did not offer the "Sex Equity Grant."
- Had transportation problems.
- Transportation problems.
- No other courses required for job.
- Divorce-family problems.
- Just did not enroll.
- No housing.
- Transferred to Norfolk State University.
- Car accident and failing grades (wouldn't let her take final exams).
- Had to take a job.
- Do not need it (classes).
- Too much time involved in the program.
- Due to GPA drop, Pell Grant was dropped. Due to husband's illness, grades dropped one quarter.

CURRENT EMPLOYMENT/EDUCATION STATUS OF NON-RETURNING STUDENTS

SCHOOL (name of school)

- JTCC
- University of Richmond
- Richard Bland
- J. Sargeant Reynolds Community College
- Virginia Tech
- JTCC
- Norfolk State University
- J. Sargeant Reynolds Community College
- VCU
- Company School

WORKING (name of company)

Kelly Temporary
Blue Cross/Blue Shield
Virginia Power
Erma E. Turpin
Retired
Ft. Lee Fire Department
CorEast Savings Bank
Retired
Philip Morris (seasonal)
DGSC
Anderson Machine
DGSC
Lyn Luck Enterprises, Inc.
Weyerhaeuser
CorEast Savings Bank
Lewis Communications
LFCC
City of Petersburg
Henrico County
Edwards/Edwards
Southside Va Training Center
Government
Easco Photo
IRS
Crestwood Builders
Town of Culpeper, Culpeper, VA
USMC (orders pending-Japan)
Philip Morris
Military
City of Virginia Beach
Property Manager
Dinwiddie County
Allied Fibers
Tom's Snack Food Co.
State Highway Department

WORKING (name of company)

Chesterfield Police Academy
Ft. Lee
State Police
Military
Self-employed
City of Petersburg
Secretary
Prince George Social Services
Carter Myers & Associates
Virginia Power
Government
Government
Bank
Philip Morris
KMart
Government
Chesterfield County Schools
Defense General Supply Center
Military
Dominion Bank
Defense General Supply Center
Defense General Supply Center
Philip Morris
Social Services
Philip Morris
Nycom Inc.
Dentist Office
Subaru (General Manager)
Rappahannock General Hospital
American Tobacco
AT & T
Government
Ft. Lee
Ft. Lee
Ft. Lee
Ft. Lee
Overnite Transportation
E.R. Carpenter
Movie Tiny Video
self-employed
Philip Morris
Acqualon (formerly Hercules)
Seamco
self-employed
Allied Chemical
Allied Chemical
Ft. Lee
Philip Morris
Virginia Power
Teacher

WORKING (name of company)

Ft. Lee military
The Children's House
Government
Military
Philip Morris
Defense General Supply Center
Bass Construction
Nursing Home
Virginia Power
Ft. Lee
Philip Morris
Sports Editor for Hopewell News
American Tobacco
Ft. Lee
Cestaro & Co., Inc.
Ft. Lee
Ballowe Electric
Construction
Virginia Power
Tri City Installation
Ukrops
Virginia Power
DuPont
Delux
AT & T
Certified Nurses Aide
Virginia Power
Hopewell City
Chippenham Hospital
Nycom
Petersburg Chamber of Commerce
Car Salesman
Welcome Food Store
Care Advantage
Building Supplies
AT & T
self employed
J. C. Penny
Ft. Lee
St. Capital Mortgage Corporation
John Randolph Hospital
Virginia Power
Nursing Assistant in homes
Virginia Power

WHAT SUGGESTIONS OR COMMENTS DO YOU HAVE THAT WILL ENABLE JTCC TO IMPROVE ITS COURSES, PROGRAMS, AND SERVICES?

- None.
- Too expensive for the quality of education I received. The instructors were below standards.
- I was disappointed in the Algebra course I took. I personally need more instruction from the teacher-not a totally individualized course.
- I feel as though JTCC has what I wanted or will want in the future.
- Courses were just fine as presented.
- As a retired person desiring to further my education, I found JTCC very supportive of my needs. I appreciate the opportunity to attend classes and hope I may return at a later date.
- Try to get a Fire Science Program back into the school.
- Not presently able to return although your courses are very in-depth and informative. Please send me some information. I would like to finish the Geriatric Nursing Asst. & Home Health Aide Course I started. Thank you.
- Enjoyed the availability of the 3 classes I took which were offered on consecutive Saturdays during summer and fall.
- The instructor & course materials were quite good: Real Estate I & II. I had no trouble passing the state exam the Saturday of the week R.E. II finished.
- Have not achieved goal yet.
- The course that I took was difficult due to the vast amount of material covered in such a small amount of time.
- Financial Aid programs for full time workers who can't afford tuition without assistance (low interest loans).
- Very, very good as it is. Too bad that your school is so far from my home.
- As far as I'm concerned, JTCC is perfect.
- Offer more telecourses & ELI courses.
- I would like to see more carpentry courses offered. In reading the course descriptions, I didn't feel like they offered me what I need. I would like to see enough courses to get a carpentry certificate.
- Army course-got AA now at St. Leo after BA.
- Counselors and instructors were very helpful.
- Very good-keep it up!
- Interested in mechanics or masonry. Course taken was mandatory (software).
- Would like a French course to be offered.
- Could not be better.
- Real Estate Appraisal course needed. Had it last Fall at Watkins. Instruction was real good. (moving first of the year)
- CAD course was very good and comprehensive for time allowed. Need an intermediate course for short cuts in CAD. Dr. Edwards was excellent!
- Courses and instructors were great.
- Good instructor. Everybody was very helpful, everything excellent. Recommend JTCC over Richard Bland or VCU.
- Very pleased.
- Offer more classes/courses on Saturday!

- JTCC is quite good.
- Will not take a self-study course next time.
- Good program. Annex is helpful but drafting courses are not offered there.
- Course no good-Real Estate.
- Offer more at Watkins-Clerical-practical classes.
- Course and Instructor were very good at Ft. Lee!
- Course taken was very satisfactory! Pleasant experience.
- Limited parking near Engineering building. Have to park too far from building.
- One course cancelled.
- Pleased with course.
- Instructor was really good but hard class.
- On site instruction.
- Would like to see more diversification (more autocad).
- I like Ft. Lee outlet.
- Very good refresher course (Grammar).
- Need more classes at Watkins Annex and a larger variety.
- Pretty happy about Ft. Lee!
- Retiring in a couple years.
- Too much material to cover in half day sessions.
- Good tennis class and instructor.
- Great instructor for time management, but crowded room!
- Very satisfied with computer course.
- Easy to enroll.
- Enjoyed courses. Instructors were great in computer courses!
- Computer literacy not offered at Ft. Lee.
- Need a greater variety of evening courses!
- Bad teacher, change teachers!
- Course was too complicated.
- Would like to see more literature in department at work on business courses offered at JTCC.
- Quite well done.
- Liked everything, counselor was good.
- Enjoyed course! Went to Richard Bland because I had heard it was hard to transfer courses from JTCC to 4-yr schools.
- Very satisfied with course content and instructor.
- Doing a good job!
- Instructors were good!
- Mother completed survey for her 12 year old who was enrolled in a course. Thought course was too easy.
- Instructor takes a lot for granted in Intro to Computer course.
- I will enroll in the Fall '88 Math course previously started. Illness prevented me from completing the course.
- Wonderful! Enjoyed the class!
- Course did not go into enough depth. Didn't show how to get data out! (computer course)
- Dropped self-taught trig course. Trig book was bad. Need to offer this course during school not as a self taught course.
- Dr. Armstrong was very good!
- Fantastic college and courses. Praise JTCC very highly!
- Want to take more courses on post (Ft. Lee) that are job related.
- Would like to get a 2 yr. degree.
- Staff in admissions was excellent. Good instructor.
- JTCC has good instructors.

- JTCC is better than Southside but JTCC does not offer the "Sex Equity Grant."
- Welding instructor should be more flexible in demonstrations. Need more on the job training.
- Not returning due to classes not offered at 8-9 am (mandatory computer offered only at one time slot).
- Need to have seminar courses (computer) at Ft. Lee.
- Need better facility at Ft. Lee.
- Keep sign language courses! ASL needed.
- Courses not offered that I needed. Needed sight for one course (I am partially blind).
- Keep up the good work.
- Enjoyed Mr. Dalton very much!
- Everything is fine.
- I liked it a lot.
- I want to come back but swing shift makes it difficult.
- Class assisted me in getting job!
- Enjoyed it; it was interesting.
- Good program, very helpful.
- Expand enrollment for CAD courses.
- It is a good school; teachers are very understanding.
- Counselors could be a lot better in getting schedules done. There is a long wait.
- Wish they had LPN classes still!
- I was treated fine.
- Liked school and teachers
- Pretty good-teachers very helpful! Was not ready to come back.
- Math courses-need more classes for remedial students-not self-study!
- Forced into courses he did not want, so he took courses he wanted anyway.
- Very nice and instructors were very helpful.
- Very pleased, except program (Funeral Service) was too long.
- Respondent very negative-JTCC bothering him.
- Need Micro Bio course and nutrition.
- What about babysitting service.
- Signed up for a class for fall semester. Would like to come back full-time but first must bring GPA up in order to qualify for Pell Grant.

JOHN TYLER COMMUNITY COLLEGE
Chester, Virginia 23831

Dear Former Student:

Our records indicate that you were enrolled at John Tyler Community College last Fall but did not return Winter or Spring Quarters 1988. We are interested in finding out if you completed your goal for enrolling or if your career plans have changed. Your comments will also assist us in improving our courses, programs and services to better meet the needs of future students.

Please help us by taking a few moments to respond to the items below. Your responses will be treated confidentially and summarized along with those from other former JTCC students. Please note that we are trying to achieve an acceptable response rate and therefore plan to follow-up non-respondents by telephone within 2 weeks.

Unless instructed otherwise, please circle (1) the most appropriate item and provide comments as necessary.

Thank you for your cooperation.

F. W. Nicholas, Sr.
President, JTCC

**PART I - PURPOSE/GOALS**

cc 1. Why did you choose to attend JTCC?
4

(1) Close to home
(2) Inexpensive
(3) Open Admissions policy
(4) Courses/Programs
(5) Availability of Financial Aid
(6) To meet job requirements
(7) Other _____
please specify

cc 2. What was your primary goal/objective for enrolling at JTCC?
5

(1) To take one or more job related courses
(2) To obtain a degree, certificate or diploma
(3) To take a few courses to help me make a career choice
(4) To complete courses in order to transfer to another college
(5) To satisfy a personal interest
(6) Other _____
please specify

cc 3. Did the JTCC course(s) assist you in achieving your goal?
6

(1) Yes, very helpful
(2) Yes, somewhat helpful
(3) No, not very helpful
(4) Not helpful at all

**PART II - REASONS FOR NOT RE-ENROLLING AT JTCC**

1. The following is a list of reasons which may have prevented you from attending college after the Fall Quarter. Please circle as many items as are applicable and provice comments where appropriate.

cc 7 (1) Courses that I needed were not available
cc 8 (2) Was failing or not doing as well as I wanted to do
cc 9 (3) Completed course(s) that I desired to take
cc 10 (4) Lack of time due to job requirements
cc 11 (5) Lack of time due to family responsibilties
cc 12 (6) Financial problems
cc 13 (7) Medical reasons
cc 14 (8) Transfer to another college _____
specify college/university
cc 15 (9) No longer interested in school
cc 16 (10) Other _____
please specify

2. From the above list, identify your primary and secondary reasons for not attending JTCC in the Winter and Spring Quarters.

cc17 Primary _____ cc18 Secondary _____

**Part III - EMPLOYMENT/EDUCATION STATUS**

1. Are you currently in school or working?

39

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| cc 19 | SCHOOL: | cc 20 | WORKING: |
| | (1) Yes _____ (Name) | | (1) Yes _____ (Name) |
| | (2) No | | (2) No |

2. What is your educational or employment status?

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| cc 21 | SCHOOL STATUS: | cc 22 | EMPLOYMENT STATUS: |
| | (1) Full time | | (1) Full time |
| | (2) Part time | | (2) Part time |
| | (3) Not in school | | (3) Not employed |

cc 23 3. Have you received a promotion as a result of a course(s) that you completed at JTCC?
(1) Yes (2) No (3) Not employed

cc 24 4. Do you plan to return to JTCC at a later date?
(1) Yes (2) No

**PART IV - What suggestions or comments do you have that will enable JTCC to improve its courses, programs, and services?**

**ATTENTION:** Before mailing, please fold so that the self-addressed, postage paid permit information is shown on the outside. No envelope is needed--simply drop in the mailbox.

Thank you for your assistance.

6/80

JC 43

JOHN TYLER COMMUNITY COLLEGE
CHESTER, VIRGINIA 23831

POSTAGE WILL BE PAID BY ADDRESSEE

BUSINESS REPLY MAIL
FIRST CLASS PERMIT NO 15 CHESTER, VA.

NO POSTAGE
NECESSARY
IF MAILED
IN THE
UNITED STATES



Institutional Research
JOHN TYLER COMMUNITY COLLEGE CHESTER, VIRGINIA 23831

Non-Profit Org.
U.S. Postage
Car-Rt. Presort
Paid
Chester, VA
Permit No. 39
Postal Customer



ERIC Clearinghouse for
Junior Colleges
FEB 14 1989